



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/078,815	02/19/2002	Adam R. Schran	10397-3U1	7133
570. 7590 07/19/2008 PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP ONE COMMERCE SQUARE 2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				
EXAMINER				
GOLD, AVIM				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2157				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/09/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/078,815

Applicant(s)

SCHHRAN ET AL.

Examiner

AVI GOLD

Art Unit

2157

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-27 and 29-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-27 and 29-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the appeal brief filed on April 8, 2008. Claims 2-27 and 29-56 are pending.

Response to Amendment

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 34 includes an "article of manufacture comprising a computer-readable medium holding computer-executable instructions".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-3, 5-12, 14, 18, 23, 26, 27, 29-30, 32-39, 41, 45, 50, and 53-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claessens et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,222,255, further in view of Rehkopf, U.S. Patent No. 6,505,249.

Claessens teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system and method for network performance testing (see abstract).

Regarding claims 7 and 34, Claessens teaches a method and an article of manufacture a method and article of manufacture of optimizing network configuration settings for a user's client machine, the method and article of manufacture comprising:

(a) defining a plurality of groups of network configuration settings (col. 10, lines 15-25, Claessens discloses different test configurations associated with identifiers);

(b) establishing a network connection between the client machine and a remote server (col. 7, line 65 — col. 8, line 3, col. 8, lines 28-33, Claessens discloses a communication session established between a client and server);

(c) selecting one of the groups of configuration settings for the client machine from the defined groups of settings (col. 10, lines 33-41, Claessens discloses choosing a configuration setting from the inventory database);

(d) automatically conducting one or more performance tests using the selected network configuration settings during the established network connection (col. 10, lines 42-63, Claessens discloses a network performance test with the selected configuration settings);

Claessens fails to teach the limitation further including repeating steps (c) and (d) for one or more other groups of network configuration settings during the established network connection and automatically adjusting the network configuration settings of the client machine, based on the results of the performance tests, wherein the adjusted

network configuration settings are settings that optimize the performance of the client machine.

However, Rehkopf teaches a method for benchmarking and optimizing the end to end processing performance of a client-server based computer system to determine the optimal values of the system variables (see abstract). Rehkopf teaches different benchmarking tests being performed (col. 2, line 59 – col. 3, line 11) and the optimal value of the performance variables chosen to modify the system and optimize performance (col. 6, lines 37-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Claessens in view of Rehkopf to repeat steps (c) and (d) for one or more other groups of network configuration settings during the established network connection and automatically adjust the network configuration settings of the client machine, based on the results of the performance tests, wherein the adjusted network configuration settings are settings that optimize the performance of the client machine. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for the use of the most efficient network configuration settings.

Regarding claims 2 and 29, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 wherein the adjustments of the network configuration settings are made through the use of an algorithm that performs statistical analysis on past network configuration setting performance test result data (col. 3, lines 13-26, col.

7, lines 3-10, Rehkopf discloses the use of statistical analysis and a statistical algorithm on past performance on the client).

Regarding claims 3 and 30, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 2 and 29 wherein regression is used to perform the statistical analysis (col. 3, lines 13-26, col. 7, lines 3-10).

Regarding claims 5 and 32, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 2 and 29 wherein the statistical analysis is performed by the client machine (col. 3, lines 13-26, col. 7, lines 3-10).

Regarding claims 6 and 33, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 2 and 29 wherein the statistical analysis is performed by the remote server (col. 3, lines 13-26, col. 7, lines 3-10).

Regarding claims 8 and 35, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 further comprising:

(g) the user specifying, via the client machine, at least one network performance preference; and

(h) executing performance metric scoring on each of the different defined groups of network configuration settings, based on a relative weight assigned to the network performance preference (col. 2 and 3).

Regarding claims 9 and 36, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 wherein logic running on the remote server statistically analyzes the results of the performance tests and determines one or more groups of network configuration settings for use on the client machine (col. 3, lines 13-26, col. 7, lines 3-10).

Regarding claims 10 and 37, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 9 and 36 wherein the logic includes an intelligent optimization algorithm which uses historical performance data to statistically assess positive or negative scoring variations when a particular network configuration setting is adjusted (col. 3, lines 13-26, col. 7, lines 3-10).

Regarding claims 11 and 38, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 wherein the adjustments of the network configuration settings are made through the use of an algorithm that determines future groups of network configuration settings to test (col. 3, lines 13-26, col. 7, lines 3-10).

Regarding claims 12 and 39, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 further comprising:

(g) continually monitoring the network configuration performance of the client machine, after step (f) has been performed; and

(h) automatically adjusting the monitored network configuration settings of the client machine to maintain optimal network performance of the client machine (col. 4, lines 35-54, Rehkopf discloses continually monitoring performance and re-evaluating).

Regarding claims 14 and 41, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 wherein one of the network configuration settings is latency (col. 8, lines 1-19, Rehkopf discloses bandwidth).

Regarding claims 18 and 45, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 wherein one of the network configuration settings is Maximum Segment Size (MSS) (col. 8, lines 1-19, Rehkopf discloses segment size).

Regarding claims 23 and 50, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 wherein one of the network configuration settings is packet size (col. 8, lines 1-19).

Regarding claims 26 and 53, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 further comprising:

(g) assigning a percentage score to each applicable network configuration setting;

(h) multiplying the relative weight of each network configuration setting by the percentage score for the network configuration setting, wherein the relative weight is determined as a function of the user's network performance preferences; and

(i) adding the resulting products of step (h) to determine a weighted overall percentage score (col. 2, 3).

Regarding claims 27 and 54, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 wherein step (b) further comprises:

(c)(i) the user selecting a group of default network configuration settings (col. 2, lines 23-30).

Regarding claims 55 and 56, Rehkopf teaches the method and article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34 further comprising:

(g) storing the plurality of groups of network configuration settings in a storage location wherein step (c) further comprises selecting one of the groups of network configuration settings for the client machine from the storage location (col. 2, 3).

3. In considering claims 4 and 31, Claessens and Rehkopf are silent in that a polynomial curve fit is used to perform statistical analysis. "Official notice" is taken that both the concept and the advantages of a polynomial curve fit are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize a polynomial curve fit as an efficient way to perform statistical analysis.

In considering claims 15-17, 19-22, 24, 25, 42-44, 46-49, 51, and 52, Rehkopf is silent in that ping time, network connection stability, Maximum Transmission Unit (MTU), Receive Window (RWIN), Time To Live (TTL), Black Hole Detection, Auto Discovery of Path Maximum Transmission Unit (MTU), upload throughput speed, and download throughput speed are various forms of network configuration settings. "Official notice" is taken that both the concept and the advantages of those settings are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to analyze and adjust those settings in the network to monitor and optimize the performance of a network.

4. Claims 13 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claessens and Rehkopf further in view of Easty et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,189,008.

Claessens teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system and method for network performance testing (see abstract). Rehkopf teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for benchmarking and optimizing the end to end processing performance of a client-server based computer system to determine the optimal values of the system variables (see abstract).

Regarding claims 13 and 40, Claessens and Rehkopf teach the method and the article of manufacture of claims 7 and 34.

Claessens and Rehkopf fail to teach the limitation further including (g) storing on the remote server, groups of network configuration settings and aggregate test results associated with other client machines that previously established a network connection

with the remote server; and (h) the user's client machine receiving groups of network configuration setting recommendations from the remote server based on the groups of network configuration settings and the aggregate test results stored on the remote server.

However, Easty teaches managing the digital assets of the endpoint servers based on aggregate profile information reflecting the preferences of the user population served by the endpoint server (see abstract). Easty teaches the use of contents recommended to a user from a database, on a server, which is based on aggregate profile that reflects the preferences of the end-user population (col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, lines 7; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Claessens and Rehkopf in view of Easty to store on the remote server, network configuration settings and aggregate test results associated with other client machines that previously established a network connection with the remote server, wherein the user's client machine receives network configuration setting recommendations from the remote server, based on the network configuration settings and the aggregate test results stored on the remote server. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for quicker and more accurate configuration settings.

Response to Arguments

5. In view of the appeal brief filed on April 8, 2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth above.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,842,431 to Clarkson et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,725,229 to Majewski et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,292,483 to Kerstein

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AVI GOLD whose telephone number is (571)272-4002. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Avi Gold

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2157

AMG

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157